DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 570 CG 021 581

AUTHOR Bolton, Christopher; Camp, Delpha J.
TITLE Measuring the Outcomes of Grief Work.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Gerontological Society (41st, San Francisco, CA, November 18-22, 1988). Supported by a grant from the National Information and Research Center.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Measures; Coping; *Death; *Emotional Adjustment; *Grief; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon Bereavement Status Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

This report describes a follow-up project based on prior research which demonstrated a possible link between post-funeral rituals and grief work. It notes that, while the degree of association between rituals and grief work was marginally statistically significant, the degree to which ritual directly influences "successful" grief work remains unclear. The absence of a reliable and valid measure that demonstrates the progressive accomplishment of the tasks of grieving is cited as a major impediment to carrying out research that demonstrates a direct relationship between post-funeral ritual acts and successful grief work. The steps involved in the construction of the prototype Oregon Bereavement Status Questionnaire, an instrument which focused on the concepts provided by experts regarding grief work and which identified the tasks of grieving, are reviewed. A literature review, a thorough item development and trial process, and a field trial with 125 individuals at various stages of grieving are discussed. It is reported that the 46-item Oregon Bereavement Status Questionnaire yielded a reliability coefficient of .75, and that a factor analysis utilizing a principal components method with varimax rotation was employed. The results of these analyses and proposed next steps are discussed. (Author/NB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Christopher Botton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# MEASURING THE OUTCOMES OF GRIEF WORK*

Christopher Bolton, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Delpha Camp, M.S., Director, Widowed and Family Grief Counseling and Assistant Professor
Center for Gerontology, University of Oregon

*Supported by a grant from the National Information and Research Center.

ED305570

## ABSTRACT

Research previously carried out by the authors demonstrated a possible link between post-funeral rituals and grief work. While the degree of association between rituals and grief work was marginally statistically significant, the degree to which ritual directly influences "successful" grief work is unclear. A major impediment to carrying out research that demonstrates a direct relationship between post-funeral ritual acts and successful grief work is the absence of a reliable and valid measure that demonstrates the progressive accomplishment of the tasks of grieving.

This presentation will discuss the several steps involved in the construction of the prototype Oregon Bereavement Status Questionnaire: instrument development focused on the concepts provided by experts regarding grief work and identified the "tasks of grieving;" a literature review; a thorough item development and trial process; a field trial with 125 individuals at various stages of grieving.

The forty-six item scale yielded a reliability coefficient of .75. A factor analysis utilizing a principal components method with varimax rotation was employed. The results of these analyses and proposed next steps will be reported.

## BACKGROUND

Research previously completed by the authors demonstrated a possible link between post-funeral rituals and the process of grief work (Bolton & Camp, 1986-1987). While the degree of association for these variables was marginally statistically significant, the degree to which ritual directly influences "successful" grief work is, as yet, unclear. A major impediment to carrying out research that demonstrates the degree of direct relationship between post-funeral ritual acts and successful grief work is the absence of a reliable and valid measure of the progressive accomplishment of the tasks of grieving.

The present instrument development project represented a continuation of the work begun with the aforementioned post-funeralization rituals research and is believed to be essential if further study of this topic is to be accomplished.

CG 021581

## INTRODUCTION

The natural response to a sense of loss is grieving. As such, grieving is a process in which the reality of the loss is accepted, the emotional bonds to the deceased are freed, there is a reorientation to the environment once shared with the deceased, and there is a reinvestment of emotional energy in someone or something other than the deceased (Worden, 1982). While painful, this disengagement, or "leave taking," from the deceased represents the essential component of "grief work." The pain which is involved in this process is an integral part of the grief experience.

Previous attempts to measure progress in grief work have demonstrated the real difficulty in ascertaining the various qualities of grieving and to ostensibly measure progress in the resolution of bereavement. Given the apparent lack of devices available to somehow verify or corroborate clinical estimates of grief work, and given the need to measure the progress of grieving in order to evaluate interventions in the grief work process, an effort in instrument development was proposed. The outcome of this effort follows.

## THE COMPONENTS OF GRIEF WORK

In order to establish a frame of reference upon which outcomes of grief work can be measured, qualities of grief indicative of an unsuccessful-successful continuum were employed. The substance of the instrument development focused on concepts provided by experts regarding grief work and their identification of the tasks of grieving (e.g. Worden, 1982; Osterweis, Solomon & Green, 1984; Raphael, 1983; Kalish, 1981) to cite only a very few. These authors have suggested that the following characteristics and concomitant grief related behaviors and attitudes represent the essential feelings to be "worked through" in the bereavement process.

Facing shock and disbelief.

This component, suggested to be present in varying degrees depending on the suddenness of the death and the bereaved's preparation for it, constitutes the first reaction to the death of a loved one. Bolton and Camp (1986-1987) indicated that an important feature of certain post-funeral leave-taking rituals was the reduction of shock and a verification of the reality of the death. The most frequently noted initial reaction to the death of someone close, whether anticipated or not, is shock, numbness, and a sense of disbelief (Blank, 1969; Raphael, 1983; Osterweis, Solomon & Green, 1984). Glick (1974) also notes that the numbness which accompanies news of a spousal death serves as a buffer against the emotional reality of the loss even when the survivor acknowledges intellectually that the loss has occurred. Raphael (1983) points out that, "These moments or hours of numbness or

shutting out give the ego time to mobilize its resources so that the death and the loss may be dealt with gradually, controlling the stimuli so they are more manageable, thus allowing the greater ego control" (p. 34). This first reaction to a loss can thus have therapeutic effects if not continued beyond a limited amount of time.

Encountering denial.

Denial differs from shock and disbelief in that it can continue on an emotional level for some time after the initial shock has abated and intellectual denial in the form of disbelief has given way to acknowledgement of the loss. Parkes and Weiss (1983) address this issue when they state, "Denial of loss and grieving ... may be incompatible with recovery because of its requirement that continued attention be given to maintaining a belief system contrary to reality. Going on as though nothing has changed is a hopeless task" (p. 158). The consensus of bereavement and grief counseling specialists is that, while it may provide a temporary shield from the impact of the pain experienced immediately after the death of someone personally close, the use of denial "...beyond a reasonable amount of time..." is seen as abnormal and can potentially lead to complicated mental health problems.

Expressing anger.

A third component of grieving is anger. Because it was the position of the present authors that grief depression is a situational defense against anger, it was deemed important to measure the presence of anger and the attitude towards the expression of anger rather than grief depression per se. Anger is distinguished from sadness and sorrow which do not suggest the elements of protest. Sadness, as a synonym for grief, suggests the acceptance of the reality of the death but without the elements of unacknowledged anger (Tatelbaum, 1980). A protest against the painful event and the sense of powerlessness and helplessness associated with grief, anger may be directed toward others, towards oneself, or both (Schneider, 1984). While usually directed towards the deceased, the identification and resolution of anger is often the most difficult task to accomplish. As stated by Worden (1982): "It (anger) can be one of the most confusing feelings for the survivor, and as such is at the root of many problems in the grieving process. If the anger is not adequately acknowledged, it can lead to a complicated bereavement" (p. 20). An aspect of angry feelings which can be troublesome is explained by Kalish (1981): "The bereaved implicitly feel that persons who have died did so on purpose to make them feel bad or to cause them to fend for themselves. A grieving person recognizes consciously that this isn't true; nevertheless, it is a way of expressing anger over having been left" (p. 190). Once acknowledged and expressed, however, conscious anger can aid in

the abatement of depression (Jackson, 1977).

Resolving guilt.

This fourth component of grief work may be the result of the feeling that one has failed to do not just what one should do but also what they could have done to prevent the death. Weizman and Kamm (1985) contend that a sense of omnipotence may be carried as a part of guilt feelings in bereavement. They state that often mourners take personal responsibility for the death; they assume that they potentially had the power to prevent the death from occurring and "...if they had acted differently and exercised more assertiveness, the death would have been avoided" (p. 48). This is reiterated by Tatelbaum (1980) who states: "There may be a fantasy of omnipotence inherent in this guilt; 'If I had been there, he/she might not have died'"(p.35). Worden (1982) suggested that guilt may also result from the individual not experiencing what they believe to be an appropriate amount of grief or sadness.

Relieving anxiety.

The fifth component of grief work identified was anxiety. Anxiety may be connected to the fear of recognizing and expressing unacceptable feelings, to the uncertainty of the future, and to the bereaved's doubts about their ability to cope without the deceased. High levels of anxiety tend to inhibit the grieving process (Jackson, 1977). As Tatelbaum (1980) suggests, "Anxiety or fearfulness that persists much beyond the loss experience is another sign of unsuccessful grief" (p. 56). Worden (1982) goes further: "...anxiety relates to a heightened sense of personal death awareness the awareness of one's own mortality heightened by the death of a loved one" (p. 21).

Personal openness.

A final construct, identified not necessarily a component of grief but believed to be an essential ingredient in the work of grieving, is psychological openness. This openness is described by Wenburg and Wilmot (1973) as an ability to be honest with oneself and with others and is considered essential to a healthy personality. This openness allows the individual to love more deeply and fully and consequently to experience grief more deeply and fully. The more deeply and fully one experiences the grief process, the better the adjustment. Each grief task requires openly working to resolve each of the components of grief work. In other words, the reality and pain of the loss cannot be achieved as long as denial is present; a withdrawal of emotional attachment cannot be achieved as long as guilt and anger are present; and satisfactory reorientation to a world without the deceased cannot take place without reduction of high levels of anxiety over lifestyle changes and the redefinition of self. The entire

grieving process requires a degree of psychological openness to the experience of pain and vulnerability.

## METHODS

### Item Development

A comprehensive review of the literature related to bereavement and grief work was conducted to ascertain the types of variables considered relevant. Based upon that literature review, experimental items were constructed. A panel of experts was asked to review the items and to determine what element of grief work they believed the item was measuring. These opinions were compared with the original intent of the items as determined by the project staff and based upon the literature reviewed. When a 60% consensus was achieved on a given item, it was considered to have sufficient face validity for inclusion in the first draft instrument. That first draft instrument contained 128 items that were intended to reflect each of the principal components of grief work discussed above (shock and disbelief, denial, anger, guilt, anxiety, and openness).

### Field Trial

The 128 item first draft instrument was field tested with 10 individuals to determine the appropriateness of item wording, acceptability of the content of the items, and whether the questions were understandable. After troublesome items were removed, a prototype instrument of 53 items was assembled.

The prototype questionnaire was then field tested with a sample of 125 individuals to determine its reliability and to gather data for factor analysis.

### Respondents and Sampling Procedures

Two sets of respondents were identified to field test the questionnaire. Sixty-seven (67) former clients of the Oregon Widowed and Family Grief Counseling Program were identified and mailed questionnaires. Another 58 subjects were selected from the survivors listed in the obituary column of the local newspaper 12 months prior to the time the study was being conducted. If a survivor listed was also listed in the local telephone directory, they were selected as a subject for the field trial. A total of 80 of the 125 subjects sampled returned useable questionnaires (a 64% response rate).

The sample consisted of 65 females and 15 males. The average age of individuals in the sample was 51 with the ages of respondents ranging from 31 to 81. The relationship to the deceased was most often as spouse (n = 41) with parents (n = 17) and adult children (n = 13) the next most frequent.

## RESULTS

The item mean for the 80 test subjects was 2.26 with a minimum of 1.14, a maximum of 3.83, a range of 2.69, and a variance of .6518. Tests of reliability were computed for the 80 useable returns. An Unequal-length Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient of .75 was obtained for the original 53 item scale.

The set of questions used in the field study was factor analyzed using the principal components method with varimax rotation to simple structure. The factor analysis indicated that 7 of the original 53 items were not significantly associated with any other items. These 7 items were discarded. The remaining 46 items were grouped into 7 factors. In all cases factor loadings equal to or greater than .3 were required for assignment to a specific component. The principal components identified by the factor analysis did not in all cases coincide with the scale assignments given the statements by the panel of experts in the original scale assignment process. Thus, while statistically associated, a number of items appeared to be incongruous logically with scale assignments. Therefore, the sub-scaling of the instrument was deferred until additional data are collected and analyzed.

A second split-halves reliability test was conducted on the 46 item scale. The results indicate an internal consistency coefficient of .73 (Chronbach's Alpha) and reliability coefficient of .75 (Guttman split-half).

Thus, the prototype bereavement status questionnaire, at the initial stage of development demonstrated relatively high reliability and internal consistency coefficients. Given the original evaluations at 60% consensus by the panel of experts and the original derivation of the questions from the theoretical literature, the content validity of the instrument is assumed reasonable.

## CONCLUSIONS

While an instrument that included prescribed sub-scales (factors) was the anticipated outcome of this effort, the lack of congruence between factors produced by principal components analysis and the sub-scales anticipated by experts prevents the definition of components within the instrument at this time. The questionnaire at present provides a reasonably sound tool which can now be further developed in intervention research as a means of clarifying the outcomes of grief work. The present instrument should be employed clinically. There is still the need for further validation and reliability assessments prior to its being considered clinically useful. As a research tool, however, it should provide the measurement device needed to allow one means of assessment in ascertaining bereavement status.

Next steps will include administration of the instrument to additional samples of individuals to reinforce its reliability;

determining the unidimensionality (or multi-dimensionality) of the measure when compared to measures of depression, life satisfaction, self-esteem and related personality variables; testing the concurrent (construct) validity of the instrument by comparing questionnaire scores with evaluations made by experienced counselors; and, developing normative information regarding time spent in bereavement, age differences, gender differences, to name only a few variables.

Researchers wishing to employ the Oregon Bereavement Status Questionnaire as an experimental prototype measure may receive a copy by contacting the senior author, Center for Gerontology, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403.

## REFERENCES


Blank, R.H. (1969) Death and Bereavement, Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.

Bolton, C.R. and Camp, D.J. (1986-1987) "Funeral rituals and the facilitation of grief work", Omega 17(4), 343-352.

Cherlune, G.J. and Associates. (1979) Self-disclosure: Origins, Patterns, and Implications of Openness in Interpersonal Relationships. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glick, I.O., Weiss, R.S. & Parkes, M.C. (1974) The First Year of Bereavement, New York: Wiley & Sons.

Jackson, E.N. (1977) The Many Faces of Grief, Memphis: Parthenon.

Jackson, E.N. (1957) Understanding Grief: It's Roots, Dynamics, and Treatment. New York: Abingdon Press.

Kalish, R.A. (1981) Death, Grief, and Caring Relationships, Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Kirscht, J.B. and Dillehay, R.C. (1967) Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky.

Miles, M.S. and Demi, A.S. (1983-1984) "Toward the development of a theory of bereavement guilt: sources of guilt in bereaved parents,", Omega 14(4), pp. 299-314.

Osterweis, M., Solomon, F. and Green, M. (1984) Bereavement: Reactions, Consequences, and Care, Washington: National Academy Press.

Parkes, C.M. & Weiss, R. (1983) Recovery from Bereavement, New York: Basic Books.

Parkes, C.M. (1972) Bereavement: Studies of Grief in Adult Life. New York: International University Press.

Rando, T.A. (1984) Grief, Dying and Death, Chicago: Research Press Co.

Raphael, B. (1983) The Anatomy of Bereavement, New York: Basic Books.

Sanders, C.M. (1982) "Effects of Sudden Versus Chronic Illness Death on Bereavement Outcomes" Omega, 13(3), pp. 227-241.

Schneider, J. (1984) Stress, Loss and Grief, Baltimore: University of Maryland Press.

## REFERENCES (Cont.)

Simos, B.G. (1979) A Time to Grieve: Loss as a Universal Human Experience, New York: Family Service Association of America.

Tatelbaum, J. (1980) The Courage to Grieve, New York: Lippincott and Crowell.

Weizman, S.G. and Kamm, P. (1985) About Mourning, New York: Human Sciences Press.

Wenburg, J.R. and Wilmot, W.W. (1973) The Personal Communication Process, New York: Wiley and Sons.

Worden, J.W. (1982) Grief Counseling and Grief Therapy, New York: Springer.

TABLE I: ITEM MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

| ITEM | MEANS | STANDARD DEVIATION | ITEM | MEANS | STANDARD DEVIATION |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1.62821 | 1.11785 | 24. | 3.46154 | 1.13609 |
| 2. | 1.37179 | .72271 | 25. | 1.34615 | .86530 |
| 3. | 1.58974 | .99917 | 26. | 2.87179 | 1.34221 |
| 4. | 1.32051 | .93272 | 27. | 1.24359 | .74181 |
| 5. | 2.51282 | .84889 | 28. | 1.42308 | .89034 |
| 6. | 2.58974 | 1.38110 | 29. | 1.96154 | 1.33331 |
| 7. | 1.34615 | .77000 | 30. | 1.70513 | 1.16339 |
| 8. | 1.98718 | 1.22202 | 31. | 2.30769 | 1.29241 |
| 9. | 1.83333 | 1.17790 | 32. | 3.29487 | 1.08243 |
| 10. | 3.52564 | .84859 | 33. | 1.42308 | .86067 |
| 11. | 2.08974 | 1.28109 | 34. | 2.19231 | 1.34896 |
| 12. | 1.73077 | 1.10104 | 35. | 1.83333 | 1.17790 |
| 13. | 2.92308 | 1.35579 | 36. | 3.08974 | 1.15304 |
| 14. | 1.96154 | 1.18915 | 37. | 1.92308 | 1.31692 |
| 15. | 3.52564 | .86376 | 38. | 1.60256 | 1.08520 |
| 16. | 2.15385 | 1.23874 | 39. | 1.17949 | .63947 |
| 17. | 2.79487 | 1.17726 | 40. | 2.11538 | 1.64341 |
| 18. | 3.83333 | .54455 | 41. | 2.94872 | 1.18319 |
| 19. | 1.14103 | .50257 | 42. | 2.60256 | 1.33231 |
| 20. | 3.64103 | .77249 | 43. | 1.69231 | .99750 |
| 21. | 1.61538 | 1.05966 | 44. | 1.48718 | .97692 |
| 22. | 2.93590 | 1.20970 | 45. | 3.43590 | .93406 |
| 23. | 3.51282 | 1.04127 | 46. | 3.29487 | 1.10617 |

TABLE 2
ITEM FACTOR VALUES AND COMMUNALITY INDEX

| ITEM # | FACTOR 1 | FACTOR 2 | FACTOR 3 | FACTOR 4 | FACTOR 5 | FACTOR 6 | FACTOR 7 | COMMUNALITY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.657 | 0.306 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.67764 |
| 2 | 0.613 | 0.320 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.73892 |
| 3 | 0.594 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.71117 |
| 4 | 0.566 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.374 | -0- | -0- | 0.77110 |
| 5 | 0.540 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.74646 |
| 6 | 0.532 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.76318 |
| 7 | 0.522 | -0- | 0.361 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.65830 |
| 8 | 0.516 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.80782 |
| 9 | 0.510 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.444 | -0- | -0- | 0.70290 |
| 10 | -0.495 | -0- | 0.373 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.368 | 0.80579 |
| 11 | 0.485 | -0- | 0.315 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.76103 |
| 12 | 0.481 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.410 | -0- | -0- | 0.82609 |
| 13 | 0.478 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.383 | -0.377 | -0- | 0.80473 |
| 14 | 0.469 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.64798 |
| 15 | 0.478 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.67796 |
| 16 | 0.469 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.315 | -0- | 0.77790 |
| 17 | 0.447 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.74759 |
| 18 | 0.445 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.59002 |
| 19 | -0- | 0.649 | -0- | 0.335 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.76255 |
| 20 | 0.380 | -0.609 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.310 | -0- | 0.78345 |
| 21 | -0- | 0.590 | 0.372 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.83252 |
| 22 | -0.385 | 0.503 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.315 | -0- | 0.78791 |
| 23 | -0.344 | 0.474 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.72568 |

TABLE II: CONT

| ITEM # | FACTOR 1 | FACTOR 2 | FACTOR 3 | FACTOR 4 | FACTOR 5 | FACTOR 6 | FACTOR 7 | COMMUNALITY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 | 0.346 | -0.458 | -0- | -0- | -0.308 | 0.418 | -0- | 0.80733 |
| 25 | -0- | 0.443 | -0- | -0- | 0.418 | 0.338 | -0- | 0.77969 |
| 26 | -0.364 | -0.396 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.312 | -0- | 0.63161 |
| 27 | -0- | -0- | 0.649 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.83203 |
| 28 | -0- | 0.336 | -0.509 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.75504 |
| 29 | 0.440 | -0- | -0.455 | 0.354 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.84601 |
| 30 | -0- | -0- | 0.361 | -0- | 0.323 | -0- | 0.303 | 0.75562 |
| 31 | 0.306 | -0- | -0- | 0.614 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.70579 |
| 32 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0.601 | -0- | 0.399 | -0- | 0.72933 |
| 33 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.495 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.74934 |
| 34 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.452 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.77989 |
| 35 | 0.338 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0.570 | -0- | -0- | 0.79383 |
| 36 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0.383 | -0- | 0.67156 |
| 37 | -0- | -0- | -0.440 | -0- | 0.329 | -0- | 0.582 | 0.74269 |
| 38 | 0.313 | -0- | 0.310 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.487 | 0.78613 |
| 39 | 0.399 | -0- | 0.388 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.470 | 0.65642 |
| 40 | -0- | 0.424 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0.463 | 0.85691 |
| 41 | 0.338 | 0.353 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.73556 |
| 42 | -0.306 | 0.352 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.80725 |
| 43 | 0.330 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.78238 |
| 44 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.73273 |
| 45 | -0- | 0.317 | -0- | -0.369 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.74622 |
| 46 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | 0.319 | -0- | -0- | 0.70778 |